

Appendix 4-6

Round 6 APEP Questions and Comments

Round 6 (August – September 2015) – EIA: Effects and Mitigation Confirmation

The purpose of the Round 6 meetings was to present and gather additional input on the potential effects and preferred mitigation for the Project.

Dates of meetings:

- August 24, 2015 (Poplar River First Nation);
- September 10, 2015 (Berens River First Nation); and
- September 15, 2015 (Winnipeg Public Open House).

Meeting materials are presented in **Annex A**. A summary of comments and questions from Round 6 is provided in **Tables 4-6.1 to 4-6.4**.

Table 4-6.1: Round 6 Summary of Comments – Berens River First Nation and NAC

Topic	Comments
Overall Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The potential effect on community member livelihood related to an increase in public access to previously inaccessible areas and natural resources (e.g., moose, fish, mineral extraction) by “outsiders”; and ▪ Strong support for mitigation measures that address disturbance from construction activities and increased public access.
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were various forest fires in the area this summer, particularly in July and early August; ▪ The boreal forest is very important to the community; and ▪ For VCs associated with vegetation, suggested revegetation along the alignment and at borrow locations from construction were identified as important to community members and strongly supported.
Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Caribou calving occurs on the west side of the alignment and they migrate to areas east of the alignment; ▪ Comments received related to the potential effects of blasting residue on the food chain including water and meat of mammals that are regularly consumed by community members; ▪ Suggest that ESRA consider using signage for trapline boundaries; ▪ For VCs associated with moose, caribou and furbearers, suggested mitigation to address potential changes to habitat were identified as important and strongly supported; ▪ For VCs associated with birds and herptiles, suggested mitigation measures to address potential changes to habitat and disturbance from construction activities; ▪ Suggested mitigation measures for accidental collision between wildlife and vehicles were supported; and ▪ Discussions related to restricting hunting along the road involved mention of discussions with MCWS regarding the extension of a wildlife refuge along the road alignment.

Topic	Comments
Aquatic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For VCs associated with fish, suggested mitigation measures to address potential changes to habitat and disturbance from construction activities, importance to and strongly supported; ▪ Suggested mitigation measures for accidental collision between herptiles and vehicles were supported; ▪ Suggested mitigation measures for river crossings (i.e., clear spans, erosion and sediment control) were identified as important and strongly supported; ▪ For stream crossings, maintaining travel routes using culverts and implementing erosion and sediment control measures at culverts were important and strongly supported; and ▪ The importance of, and support for providing portages and restricting boat launch and snowmobile access points at stream crossings was mixed.
Heritage, Culture, and Tradition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For VCs associated with heritage and traditional use as well as loss or damage to heritage/cultural/community use sites due to construction were identified as important and strongly supported. The relocation of heritage/ cultural sites was flagged as “Maybe” indicating that support for or against was dependent on the site-specific situation.

Table 4-6.2: Round 6 Summary of Comments – Poplar River First Nation

Topic	Comments
Overall Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elders and community members felt they had been heard, enjoyed having ESRA participate in these discussions, and invited ESRA back for additional community meetings as part of the functional design process; ▪ Community members in general supported moving ahead with construction of the road. While individuals may have questions in regards to specific sites, the participants believed it was important to move forward with the Project without delays; ▪ Several community members asked how much investigation had been done in regards to locating the P4-ASR alignment along the existing hydro line corridor; and ▪ Restricting construction worker activity to the project area only as a suggested mitigation measure resulted in half of respondents supporting the concept, and the other half indicating ‘maybe’. Comments after the meeting by several community members indicated that some people may have interpreted this mitigation measure as restricting access of community members working on the project.
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The majority of respondents indicated ‘maybe’ to the proposed mitigation measure of ‘restrict timing of clearing to fall and winter only’.
Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a split by respondents in regards to the mitigation measure ‘avoid and protect active nesting/spawning areas and maintain undisturbed no-go zones’.

Topic	Comments
Aquatic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proper design of stream crossings is important to maintain fish habitat and community access; ▪ Large box or round culvert designs for stream crossing points as shown on the panels and in the presentation will maintain fish habitat and community access by canoe, small boat, and snowmobile. These are an improvement over smaller culverts shown earlier in the process; ▪ Drainage needs to include proper erosion controls and take into account spring flooding levels. Prompt spill response is also important; and ▪ A significant majority of respondents supported restricting boat launch and snow mobile access points around river and stream crossings.
Heritage, Culture, and Tradition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respondents were divided in response to the proposed ‘relocate sites or objects’ mitigation measure, with three respondents indicating ‘yes’, three indicating ‘maybe’, and one indicating ‘no’. Subsequent discussion indicated that dialogue with Elders and community members would be an appropriate starting point for mitigation if heritage or cultural sites and objects are found during construction.

Table 4-6.3: Summary of Comments – Winnipeg Public Open House (September 2015)

Topic	Comments
Overall Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions were raised related to extending the wildlife preserve to areas along the alignment and the potential effects of hunting restrictions if it was for the two communities.
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments.
Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both communities should be meaningfully involved in the management of any wildlife preserves.
Aquatic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments.
Heritage, Culture, and Tradition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments.

Table 4-6.4: Round 6 Summary of Questions and Responses

Question	Response from ESRA
Berens River First Nation and NAC	
What are the potential effects of blasting residue on the food chain including water and meat of mammals that are regularly consumed by community members?	The rock has been tested and has not been found to be acid bearing. ESRA generally does not blast near water, except at crossings, where DFO regulations are followed.
It was suggested that the community have access to independent environmental monitoring reports for work around rivers.	ESRA committed to providing access to environmental monitoring reports.

Question	Response from ESRA
Poplar River First Nation	
How are water levels measured at water crossing sites? How is the water level used for designs determined to ensure continued access by fish, wildlife, canoes, etc.?	Water levels were measured during field investigations and peak levels (1:2 year event) inferred from the bank full height. From this and other information Engineers calculate flows to determine the designs for bridges and culverts to maintain fish passage and navigation.
Was the hydro alignment considered? There are lots of roads around there.	The hydro line exhibits poor characteristics for an all-season road due to the distance from road building materials. The hydro line is similar to winter road alignment and is located in bog/fen areas.
Will bridges be considered instead of culverts where appropriate?	Four bridge sites are known, other crossing sites are being reviewed to assess local use of the areas so that waterways are not impeded.
Winnipeg Public Open House	
There is an airplane crash site near the project area. Could a memorial marker be placed along the road alignment, and the crash site be avoided?	ESRA indicated that the site would be avoided, and they would look into whether a marker could be placed along the P4-ASR route.
What training programs are in place for local community members to be employed in the Project? Are there any minimum local labour thresholds that any construction firm would have to meet? How will the local communities benefit from this Project in terms of employment?	ESRA explained the existing CBAs are in place with the communities, the existing job training initiatives, and the fact that there is a minimum local labour participation threshold for each project. ESRA indicated that these are being exceeded for construction projects, with one example being close to 75% of labour on a project being from the local community. At present, 95 members of the Berens River First Nation community are employed in ESRA related construction jobs.
In regards to potentially restricting hunting from the road, if there is a proposal to extend the George Barker Wildlife Refuge on either side of the road alignment and the current Preserve restricts hunting for 1,000 m on either side of the road - what are the potential effects on local First Nations hunters?	ESRA indicated that there are ongoing discussions between MCWS and the two communities about a wildlife refuge in this area; however, there are no details at this time in regards to any hunting restrictions, width of the refuge, etc. ESRA noted that these discussions are occurring between the First Nations and MCWS, ESRA has not been a part of these discussions.
Is road maintenance within ESRA's mandate, and will ESRA be involved in these roads once they are built?	ESRA indicated that maintenance of the roads are within their mandate, and if for some reason this were to change the roads would be maintained by the Province of Manitoba as part of the provincial road network.
How will the project affect the existing fresh water fishery, and the fish station? If the P4-ASR connects to Berens River First Nation, how will the freshwater fishery and fish station be affected? Will the fish station be connected to the P4-ASR in some manner to allow for transportation of fish via truck?	ESRA indicated that while this is outside of the scope of the Project, ESRA is aware of ongoing discussions between Berens River and representatives of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board in regards to this issue.